

"It is natural for the American administration to blacklist Hezbollah and the other struggling Palestinian factions."

Sheik Nasrullah issued a prohibition against any form of assistance to the American operation in Afghanistan, calling it, "a war against every Muslim who refuses to bow or kneel to the United States."

In southern Lebanon, Sheik Nabil Qaook, the strategist of the guerrilla campaign against Israel, said in a speech during the weekend: "The U.S. lists don't bother us the slightest. When America accuses Hezbollah, we take it as proof of the credibility of our goals."

"In the past, America didn't shout so loud. When it is in a dominating position and when the rules of the international game are in its favor, we don't hear accusations of terrorism. But when the balance of power leans the other way, we hear them scream."

REINSTATEMENT OF MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the service in the Armed Forces for all American men has been an experience that has I think unified us in this country. It has been a common experience of getting up early in the morning, eating mediocre food, but mostly understanding how the military works and understanding the importance of patriotism in this country.

I ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to realize that within a few years there will be nobody in this Chamber that has served in the military. In a few years, there will be nobody in State legislatures that has served in the military except, possibly, for maybe a few heroes that have come back and had the name ID that allows them to run for political office.

I think that is a great danger in terms of the understanding of legislative bodies here in the U.S. House of Representatives, over in the U.S. Senate and certainly in all our legislative bodies, the State legislatures, as well as municipal jurisdictions. That experience of serving in the military has unified us.

I have been working on legislation for the past 5 years that would reinstate military conscription in a process that is both voluntary and mandatory. It would direct the Secretary of the Army and the President to reinstate a conscription between 6 months and 1 year where those individuals would go through a kind of orientation of boot camp, but also the learning of international relations, the learning of terrorism and how terrorists work and where they come from, a better understanding of the different goals of the countries around the world, and then after, but also the military discipline of that kind of basic boot camp orientation.

After that there would be a discretion. If they do not want to continue to serve in that kind of military combat training role for the rest of that 6-

month period or for the rest of that year period discretionarily, they would have the option of working in community service or going into AmeriCorps or going into some other service for the government. They would receive modest pay but exceptional training to bring back that kind of unity of experience that is so important, I think, as we conduct business that involves, more and more, the rest of the world.

An understanding of international relations has been so obvious since the September 11 attack on this country. I would encourage my colleagues to call me or my office to get a copy of this draft legislation, to look into the possibility of renewing military conscription in both a mandatory and a voluntary way that they could earn credits with the GI Bill of Rights provisions for the time that they serve their country.

It would give those individuals the kind of experience, but more than that, it would be a binding force of common experience that would hold this country together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION MEETING IN QATAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to draw my colleagues' attention to yesterday's New York Times, the front page. There are some stories there that bear an interrelationship that is important.

There was a major story about the World Trade Organization's upcoming meeting in Qatar in the Middle East, the first meeting that the WTO will be holding since Seattle; and the story talks about the World Trade Organization and some of the difficulties that it has been having in gaining broad-based public support for its activities and deliberations; and in fact, the story implies that if these meetings in Qatar are not successful, it might spell the demise of the WTO and the type of globalization initiatives that have ensued since this Congress passed GATT just a few years ago when the WTO was set up.

One of the reasons it says that these talks are having difficulty is because of the fact that the world trade system has resulted in widening disparities between the very rich and the very poor, and it is very interesting that the meeting is being held in a part of the world which demonstrates the wide disparity in incomes between the very rich and the very poor.

On the same front page there was a story about the rumblings in South Africa that have come since independence was granted, and what does it talk about? It talks about the growing disparity in South Africa between the very rich and the very poor and the fact that thousands and thousands of people are having their electricity shut off, are not able to earn a living, rising unemployment levels and that globalization without a social contract, and those are my words, not the words of the New York Times, creates a rising poverty and rising wealth for only the few, and that our globe is being affected by these forces, these powerful economic forces in all regions.

Recently, this week, Secretary Powell has met with the top leaders of Bangladesh. Bangladesh, one of the poorest nations in the world, which has a \$2 billion trade deficit with the United States.

How do these stories connect? These stories connect because in Bangladesh over 3,500 contract shops operate, producing over a billion garments for the world, half of which come here to the United States.

Women in that country make caps that are worn by athletic teams at all of our major universities, for example. They are forced to sew 320 caps per hour if they want to keep their job, and their bosses want them to increase it to 370 caps per hour. For each cap, they are paid a penny and a half. Those caps arrive in our country for a total of \$1 for total costs of production and shipment, material, labor and transportation. And then they are sold, on average, inside this economy for \$17 to \$19 a cap.

Now, the foreign minister of Bangladesh wants us to remove further tariffs on these items coming to our country. And what I am thinking is, even if we remove the tariffs, what guarantees are there that the women of that country would get a living wage? There is absolutely no guarantee.

The trading system that this globalization regimen has put in place has put a downward pressure on workers across this world; and they are rising up in South Africa, in the Middle East, in South America. We saw their faces in Seattle. Somebody had better pay attention to what is wrong with this global trading system. It works to the benefit of the few at the cost of the many.

I am for trade. I have a trading district, but I am for the dignity of the working person whether they work on the farm or whether they work in the factory, wherever in the world they exist. This world trading system must have a social contract, and without that we are going to have political tremors across this world, the likes of which the free nations have never experienced before.

I would say that you must have free trade among free people. And that trade regimen that is put in place by the laws we pass and by the institutions like the World Bank and the

International Monetary Fund and the Export-Import Bank, if they do not give credence to democratic rights and freedoms then, my goodness, what are we doing?

So I would commend to my colleagues, take a look at the New York Times. Think about the connection between WTO and Qatar this week and what is going on in South Africa, and what is going on in Mexico where wages have been cut in half, and what went on in Seattle when people did not earn enough for the work they do.

What kind of system is this country promoting?

CREATING SAFER AIRLINE TRAVEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I do not come often to the well of the House, but today I feel it is essential that I address both my fellow colleagues here today and the American people because we are now in the process of considering airport security. And the debate, in my opinion, has degenerated to do we, in fact, hire Federal workers or do we hire non-Federal workers when, in fact, the House of Representatives and the Senate clearly agree on two things that are existing today.

One is that we need to up and improve the standards; secondly, that the existing contractors who are doing the job today, that is supposed to result in our safety in the air, are not doing their job properly.

Only yesterday when Chicago was proven to be a hopeless sieve, and other cities when it was shown that these workers, many of them, most of them not citizens, operated by a foreign corporation that does not even ensure that the background checks are done, even after paying a huge fine, they continue to not do the background checks. They continue to not meet the requirements that will lead to America's safety.

I get on an airplane virtually every week. I have over 100,000 miles this year alone going back and forth to my district. I as much as any other member of this great Nation have a vested interest in airline safety, as do all of my colleagues here today and on the other side of the House.

There is no question that we must act and act immediately. From this body we do not call on the administration to specific action, but I call on all of us in government to immediately fire these contractors who have failed to protect us, those contractors who continue to violate the laws. Do not fine them; fire them. I believe that while we are deciding who can protect us better, I would feel much safer having my county sheriff standing there, having my California National Guard and every other State's National

Guard. And I know that those men and women with minimal supervision on Day One will be U.S. citizens, will speak, read, write English, will understand better what behavior that is not consistent with a normal passenger would be, and they will be motivated for airline safety. Pay them what they need to have. Get them there today.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot wait until our law is passed, until it is conferenced, until it is signed, until it is enacted. Mr. Speaker, we, in the Federal Government before Monday morning comes, before we fly on Veterans' Day, we must have better airline safety. I call on all of us to act and act immediately to bring the kind of safety to our airports that we can bring only by replacing these proven criminal corporations and getting their questionable employees off the system, off the payroll and bringing in loyal Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for this to be enacted and enacted before our great holiday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CHARITABLE DONATIONS FOR SEPTEMBER 11 ATTACK VICTIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection had a hearing where we listened to the new chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Tim Muris, and we talked about a lot of issues that are under his control. On the previous day, we had a hearing of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations in which the chairman did an excellent job dealing with questions of the charities that have been created as a result of the September 11 catastrophe.

The outpouring of support from Americans is truly magnanimous since this tragedy. But we have to be sure that the contributions that are made expressly for the purpose of aiding fellow Americans in the wake of these attacks are used for the right purpose. In my home State we had Hurricane Andrew, which was a major catastrophe, a calamity; and we had the same type of outpouring of contributions that were given to help the victims of that hurricane, and, likewise, since September 11 we have had the same thing occur here in this country.

Americans regularly give to charities. A recent study in the Washington Times indicates that the average household gives about \$1,600 or 3.2 per-

cent of their income to charities. In addition, about \$1 billion has been donated for relief efforts. The outpouring of donations since the attack provides further evidence of the desire and instinct of Americans to help their fellow man.

□ 1345

That is a given.

But, Mr. Speaker, the problem is a lot of these charities are keeping these monies, they are not distributing it, and there are roughly 50,000 people that are unemployed up in New York because of the September 11 calamity. And with the 5,000 people killed, there are roughly 7,000 children without parents. So we need these charities to step forward and to go ahead and distribute this money as quickly as possible.

Earlier this year, and recognizing the vital roles of charity, especially charitable foundations, I introduced legislation to abolish an antiquated excise tax that not-for-profit foundations pay on their net investment income. I am hopeful my colleagues will support this and it will be part of the stimulus package, because if we do not have this antiquated excise tax on the not-for-profit foundations, they will have more money to distribute.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, Americans are very generous in their donations, and yet we hear stories of people saying they went to ground zero and went to the various charitable organizations and lo and behold they could not get money. A few did, but for the most part they got very little money. So I am here this afternoon to encourage the charities to distribute the money and realize that in the end the money that they collected is for those 50,000 people unemployed who cannot make mortgages and those roughly 7,000 children that are without fathers and mothers.

Let me conclude by saying that the FTC, in the hearing we had today, indicated in testimony that their findings are that fraud cases are few and far between. So while there has been some talk about these charitable organizations as scam activities, from what the FTC chairman has seen, these frauds are few and far between. And I am heartened and pleased to hear the agency is aggressively monitoring and investigating any attempts of fraud within charities to take advantage of the September 11 occurrence.

We need to highlight here in the House and the Senate how important it is that we show confidence in these charities, but at the same time the charities need to show and demonstrate that they are helping by distributing the money.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Monohan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagreed to the amendment of the House to the bill